



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,182	12/28/2001	Mika H. Laaksonen	061602-5375	4864
30542 7590 04/01/2009 FOLEY & LARDNER LLP P.O. BOX 80278 SAN DIEGO, CA 92138-0278				
EXAMINER				
JONES, HEATHER RAE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/01/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/036,182

**Applicant(s)**

LAAKSONEN, MIKA H.

**Examiner**

HEATHER R. JONES

**Art Unit**

2621

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) HEATHER R. JONES.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Hector Agdeppa (Reg. No. 58,238).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 20 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Takemura (Patent 6,657,658) and Sato (Patent 6,650,365).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner further explained the Response to Arguments section in the office action mailed on 12/23/2008 as well as how the Examiner was combining the Takemura and Sato references in the rejection of claim 1.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Thai Tran/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621